

312 or too little water; never is it "just right." If there is too much, a drainage project must be undertaken to make much-needed land available for cultivation.

312 The most noteworthy reclamation project before the turn of this century was the draining of Lake Kopais, just north of Thebes in Central Greece.¹⁸
471 The work was undertaken by a French company in 1886 and completed by an English company in 1887, which continued to operate the agricultural estate of sixty thousand acres down to its purchase by the Greek government prior to the November elections of 1952. At that time, this large holding, along with its complicated drainage system, was turned over to the former tenants, who had worked for the foreign company. Now as owners, or as members of a cooperative, they face the necessity of making their contribution to the over-all maintenance of the drainage channels so that the water may run off adequately and prevent the land from reverting to its once-marshy condition. According to some foreign technicians, the Greeks are doing a good job of managing this operation.

[427]
• [474]
312 Much of the time, however, there is too little water through the growing season. One answer to this scarcity has been the recent drilling of hundreds of wells, from which water is pumped to the thirsty fields through irrigation ditches. In addition, a number of ambitious water-control projects have led to considerable storage of water and the spread of irrigation.

312 In villages, usually on the edges of plains watered by streams flowing from a mountain source, the water crier is a unique institution. This individual is encountered, for instance, in the Peloponnesos, where he strides through the streets of the village calling out the name of the person whose patches of land are next in line to receive the flow of water. One of these criers had a voice so powerful that, while standing on the small plain below, he could notify people in the village on the mountainside hundreds of yards away.

312 A Greek villager, like the Arab, will make much over the merits of the water of his homeplace. To praise the water he will speak of it as *cho-nephtiko nero*, or "digestive water." He will even fight over it, as the following news item shows.
423
628

Athens. The Kentucky mountaineers' storied concept of feudin' justice reached here recently and two girls were killed and four men were critically injured.

Two Greek villages — Kerasovo and Papadates — went to war a few days ago to settle a dispute over water rights, and 400 men, women, and children battled for hours with clubs, hoes, knives and hand grenades.

Two army companies were sent to restore order.

The cause of the trouble was water. Sovereignty over Cold Fountain, a spring irrigating the wheat-fields of Kerasovo, was contested by the farmers of neighboring Papadates.

361 the buildings around the plateia catch the eye. The church with its bell
[764] tower and dome is easily spotted. The cemetery is at the edge of the village,
we are told, "back there where you passed the row of tall cypress trees."
The school is usually nearby. If school is in session, then the noise of chil-
[623] dren at recess can be distinctly heard, as can the bell which calls them
indoors. A sign rather than the size of the building announces the head-
quarters of the local village council. Many villages have a cooperative so-
[474] ciety, identified by a sign on its office near the plateia. Other coffeehouses
and one or two small grocery stores account for the rest of the buildings
on the square.² The universality of these coffeehouses and small shops is
[275] shown in Table 1, presenting the services provided in eight villages of more
than a thousand in population, in the early 1950s.³ Some of the items
deserve fuller explanation.

256 *The flour mills.* In the case of the Xanthe village, four of the flour mills were
[433] built during the occupation, the other two long before then. These mills operate
not more than a total of thirty days each during the year because local grain
production is very limited and also because local people get their ration flour
ready-ground from the government.

[402] The one flour mill in the Mesolongi village has an old engine which uses
charcoal for fuel and which hardly works more than two days a week. Most of
the time it is under repair. Many of the villagers are therefore obliged to take
their grain to the mills of neighboring villages.

The bakeries. In the larger villages these find sufficient business to stay open
not only to sell their goods but to bake throughout the day for the village house-
wives, who bring in either unbaked loaves of bread or some dish for the ovens.
With fuel so scarce in many parts of the country, it is much more economical
at times for a family to take an uncooked casserole to the commercial baker
than to try to bake it at home.

443 *The village stores.* In one of the Macedonian villages the yearly gross sales
of the seven stores run from just less than \$700 for the smallest one to \$3330
452 for the two largest. These same two largest ones extend over \$1000 of credit
[434] each year, while the smallest one gives no credit.

[472] The owners of these stores purchase their goods directly from wholesale
dealers in Salonica and bring them to the village with trucks or horsecarts.
They do not hire any outside laborers, but use their sons or family members for
[437] the work. All stores sell for cash, credit, or take different farm products as
payment. The credit extended to farmers by the different shopkeepers depends
on the financial situation and the economic standing of the customers. More
credit is given to farmers who own livestock because they are able to pay
back their debts at more frequent intervals than ordinary farmers, who can pay
back their debts only once a year after harvest. No direct interest is charged
on credit goods, but their price is usually such as to include the interest.

The studies cited contain much more information about these village
stores. The stock carried may include food, clothing, and farm implements.

Thessaly

Land as a Birthright

69

Another village in Thessaly tackled this crucial problem of strip holdings in its own way. This village, Nees Karyes, south of Larissa on the main road to Lamia, was another place the director of agriculture wished to visit. On our way there we picked up the agriculturist who, like a county agent, had been the chief adviser to the peasants while they were planning their successful scheme. He recounted the development of the program as we drove to the village. The people of Nees Karyes, like those of Thoma, were also refugees, but they had come to Greece much earlier, in 1907, from Eastern Roumelia, now a part of Bulgaria. Otherwise, they were ordinary villagers, some with more land, some with less. It was the peasants with less who devised a plan.

After World War II, they realized that they could no longer make ends meet with what they had. In May 1952 twenty-three of the men with the smallest holdings in the village came together to talk about what would happen if they pooled their farms and other resources. The land of these 23 families totaled about 575 acres, showing an average per family below that for the other 200 families in the village, but well above the figure for Thessaly. They talked and talked, swapped ideas and contacted the agricultural-extension agent in Larissa. In October 1952 they held their first assembly. They decided to buy a tractor and to follow the advice of the agricultural specialist as to improved methods, type of seed, kind of equipment needed. They decided to combine the 575 acres for production purposes into one farm. The various types of soil are now used to best advantage. Fortunately, the first year had been a good crop year and successes far outstripped expectations. The cooperative into which they organized themselves bought a combine for 60,000 drachmas (\$4,000 at the rate of exchange in 1952). But since they would have had to pay out five sixths of that to others as charges for harvesting their grain, they are in reality only 10,000 drachmas (\$667) in debt, and sure of the future.

Since this idea of pooling land sounded so much like a collective farm on the Communist model, the government carefully investigated to be sure no subversive influences were at work before it granted any loans. The planners proved to be far from subversive, merely independent peasants with a common-sense approach to an old, old problem.

Our first stop in the village was at a big brick-walled granary almost completed by the cooperative. There we talked with the villager who was the cooperative's secretary. He paid great tribute to the part the government agricultural worker had played in the success of their undertaking. While we fingered the heaped golden grain on the cement floor of the impressive building, I asked, "What made you begin this cooperative in the first place?" The answer was a single eloquent word: "Necessity."

The founders of this cooperative, the twenty-three village families with

423
474
241

[167]

[242]
[407][435]
[407]

[52]

[343]

[242]

423 the smallest holdings, must have found sweet consolation in knowing that
474 now many of their more advantaged village neighbors wish to join the
241 cooperative pool. But this poses a problem. "How," the secretary asked
anxiously, "can we calculate what arrangement to make with these people?
How can we know what to charge them for the risk we took, the major
expenses we bore? Certainly, now that we have succeeded, it would not
be fair for them to come in and benefit free of cost from the pioneering
work that we have done."

As these cooperative members talked of their plans, their eyes glowed
with happiness and enthusiasm. The men had concrete proposals to solve
other problems. They expect to shift from sole concentration upon grain
production to more diversified farming, including livestock and poultry
production, the raising of dry legumes and other crops that tend to give em-
ployment to the able-bodied members of the cooperating families.

International recognition as well as scientific farming is coming to Nees
Karyes. Today there are people from Yugoslavia and Israel, as well as
touring Americans, who have seen the way some of the peasant families in
this village of Thessaly set about solving their problem of too little land in
too many strips cultivated in unscientific ways. The secret of this under-
taking, in great part at least, lies in the feeling of responsibility on the part
of those who participate, since they originated and now conduct and plan
for the cooperative which they jointly own.

PRESSURE ON THE LAND

161 Most rural Greeks, however, struggle along with insufficient resources
241 and with no cooperative venture such as Nees Karyes to give them hope.
511 A village cobbler from Karpenesi in Central Greece explained the matter
in this way: "There has been such an increase in population that the fields
are no longer sufficient. The village child today lives more poorly than did
his father as a child, because there are more mouths to feed and no added
resources."

[565] A well-informed Greek official put the problem in excellent perspective:
"Today there is less income per family, less food, and the land values go
up. Those that have more land become better off, leading to totally new
economic and social distinctions in the villages. Many of our farmers are
trying to make a living on such small farms that all they produce is hate.
The main problem of the Greek farm family is the population problem.
There are too many people. The villager with nothing to do has no place
to go in search of work. That is why you see here in Athens many strong,
healthy men selling matches. They have no work to do either in their vil-
lages or here in the city."

What the Greek villagers are up against in one part of the Peloponnesos
is revealed in *Greece, Ripe for Improvement*:

The Peasant at Work

85

acres a day with a tractor. "Before the war," he went on to say, "a peasant who tried something new was considered an amusing person with a loose screw in his head. Even the agriculturists were received with 'what have those educated people got to tell us who have callouses from working?' Also, the agriculturist has learned more about agriculture and more about people, changing for the better."

The director's wife agreed with what we had learned from Alekos about the effect of mechanization upon woman's work. She did point out that machine harvesting and threshing had relieved the housewife of an old burden of feeding many people for long periods of time when the work was done by hand. However, the women still plant tobacco and cultivate cotton. Men are helping out a little more, but this hard field work in Thessaly is still a woman's job. Here again there is some compensation for the women. Although they have as much work now as before, they have more money. They will change into better dresses in the evening and go for a walk on a weekday, something much less common before the last war. Finally, the director's wife pointed out, those families who own twenty to twenty-five acres of land have acquired ease and prosperity and are becoming a well-to-do peasantry.

Elsewhere around Larissa we inquired about the spread of mechanization. The tractor dealers in the town put Alekos' problems in a somewhat different light. We learned, for example, that a 46-horsepower tractor, with starter and pneumatic tire wheels, cost 55,000 drachmas (\$3,667); the purchaser had to pay 40 percent in cash and could sign a bill for the remaining 60 percent, payable after 18 months to the Bank of Greece at the rate of 16 percent interest. Dealers and some of the local government officials considered this rate most oppressive.

A second problem was that of spare parts, most of which had to be imported. Foreign-exchange difficulties and import restrictions make this difficult; when the parts were not available, the owner of the tractor was greatly inconvenienced, to put it mildly. We got some idea of the problem of spare parts when we learned that there were 25 dealers of tractors of different makes in Larissa alone. The dealers attempted to teach the purchasers how to use the machine and, a year or so before, the government had set up traveling schools which instructed in the operation and care of the tractor and afterwards gave examinations for licenses. That year, out of 1,200 farm workers examined, only 700 were given a license.

Dealers also indicated that the buyer of a tractor usually ordered a plow and a disk-harrow, with many requesting grain drills. This equipment adds greatly to the total cost. Most of the tractors were bought by individuals or by a group of three to five peasants, with only twenty to twenty-five tractors belonging to cooperatives.

In the tractor land of Larissa everything seems fine now. As in the case

178
241
434

233 to 500 before the war. Rent is usually paid in milk, in an amount equaling
 427 the grain needed to seed the field pastured. If it takes normally 500 okas
 246 of seed (23.5 bushels) to put in the crop on the area rented, then the
 shepherd will pay 500 okas (1410 pounds, or 169 gallons) of milk. The
 land available has usually been in a crop the year or two before, but is
 allowed to lie fallow this one year and is thus free for pasturage. Only
 three or four Valtetsi families have been able to buy their own land down
 below, but they too bring their flocks back to Valtetsi in the spring.

434 As very little farming can be done on the steep and rocky hillsides
 464 around Valtetsi, many of its people, like those from Parthenon, go to the
 321 plains below in June to help harvest the grain. In the late fall and winter,
 465 while pasturing below, some of them help with the gathering of the olives.
 They are usually paid in kind for such work, an important way of eking
 out their annual food supply. Other income, of course, is derived from the
 sale of milk, cheese, wool, and an occasional live animal. Most of the
 426 shepherds are in debt to two outside "grocers" (whom they also call
 452 "outsiders" or "foreigners"), who advance the equivalent of about \$33 to
 a shepherd against the following season's milk products and agree to the
 578 retirement of the debt at a fixed price per oka of milk or cheese. The price
 609 is said to be put so low that the grocer seldom loses, but if there is a rise
 in price he absorbs all of the profit, further disgruntling the shepherds in-
 debted to him. Some of the conversation went like this:

"We had a bad winter this year. The pastures were not good because it
 didn't rain. We had to buy fodder to carry our flocks through and thus be-
 came heavily indebted to the grocer."

"Yes," added another, "the government shouldn't let these grocers ex-
 ploit us so."

• 474 "But," we asked, "why don't you form a dairy cooperative like some
 other villages and market your own milk products yourselves?"

157 "Oh, we could never get together on anything like that," said one, and
 all the others shook their heads affirmatively. And they then smiled half-
 ashamedly and yet amused at themselves when a city Greek pointed out
 to them, "Why are you then blaming the government when you have just
 admitted that the fault lies in your own individualism and your failure to
 cooperate?"

233 As a flock passed through the village on its way to be milked after a
 533 morning in the fields, I began to ask about the bells, whose assorted sizes
 made a peculiar and not unpleasing harmony as the animals hurriedly
 moved homewards. Then the Valtetsi shepherds confirmed what I had been
 told before — that the selection of bells is one of the tasks the shepherd
 takes most seriously. He goes to one of the metalworking shops in the
 market town and picks out a very deep bell with a pleasing tone. This he

The Changing Life of the Shepherd

103

will buy to put on his lead ram. Then he will pick another deep bell for his eldest ewe, but will always test it against the deepest bell for what seems to be harmony to his ear. As he buys the smaller bells with the higher sounds, he always compares each with the deepest bell. In a flock of about 200, he may have as many as 60 to 70 carefully tested bells. The sound of a flock grazing or in movement is always pleasing even to the casual passerby. But to the shepherd it is the sweetest music of all, for it is as though his own private orchestra were playing for him, telling him by each little sound much about the behavior of his flock. If one note is missing for very long, he becomes aware of it and investigates to see what is wrong. When all are ringing together, he feels his little universe is safe.

As I walked through the village, I tried to picture it in the cold and empty winter. Obviously, the people from Valtetsi scatter out quite widely once they get below. What kind of community can they maintain with such a migration pattern? The shepherd's answers to queries about organizational life gave a rough sketch of the Valtetsi community.

Like other villages, they have the village council. The president of the council, who happens to run a coffeehouse, must stay in the village throughout the year. He can, on occasion, get a two-week leave from the prefect in Tripolis.

"Suppose he owned livestock," I asked, "and had to take them to winter pastures below. What would he do?"

"Other members of his family would have to take care of the animals for him and he would remain here."

Local elections are postponed from winter until the return of most of the people in the spring. But for national elections the men leave the flocks with their womenfolk and older children and walk all the way back up to the village to cast their ballots.

Valtetsi also has its school board, church board, and a livestock cooperative that helps its members get some credit from the Agricultural Bank, with their flocks as collateral (it serves no marketing function). Yet the migration pattern affects even these organizations, for at the time of my visit the cooperative president had not yet returned from his winter's sojourn on the plain nor had all of the board members for the church or the school.

In spite of the periodic absence of its inhabitants, the loyalty to Valtetsi is strong. Not the least of village distinctions was the Battle of Valtetsi, in which local people claim that in 1821 the first victorious army of Greeks under Kolokotrones rose up against the Turks. Since the soldiers believed that the Virgin had aided that victory, taking part just as Hera and Athena did with their forces deployed in the Trojan War, a special church to the Virgin was built in the village in 1837. One of the most heinous

233

533

221

621

[623]

[622]

[666]

[871]

[794]

[474]

[652]

[233]

[621]

[186]

[175]

[776]

[669]

[778]

621 crimes of the Communist guerrillas in the late 1940s, according to the
 669 people, was their willful mutilation by bullets of some of the church's prized
 [778] icons of the Virgin and saints.

233 Even when their houses are repaired and a new school is built as a result
 427 of a gift by former Valtetsi residents now in the United States, the problems
 241 of the people will not be solved. Every year they find it more difficult to
 [511] locate grazing land for their flocks on the plains below, and they cannot
 get back to their prewar standard of living unless they can double or treble
 the number of their sheep. One complained: "The different owners down
 below are putting in crops on the land that used to lie fallow. They ask
 more money if we increase the size of our flocks. Since I had trouble with
 the man from whom I have been renting in the past near Kranidi, this year I
 went to Messenia instead. I made arrangements with a farmer to bring my
 flock there, paid him in advance, but when I got there with my sheep he
 had plowed the land promised to me and had planted potatoes. He had
 even plowed beneath the olive trees so that there was no grass for my sheep.
 I could only pasture one month there, lost the money I had paid in advance,
 and had to come back to Valtetsi ahead of schedule to get pasture for my
 flock."

233 Other shepherds in the Peloponnesos are saying the same thing. Some,
 234 with whom we talked on the road from Kalamata to Megalopolis, were
 511 anxious to get to their home villages in the mountains. They were carrying
 [221] their milk- and cheese-making equipment with them, but their women and
 children had gone on ahead to get the houses ready for summer occupancy.
 One man complained: "I haven't been able to make ends meet although
 I have two hundred sheep and have sold four thousand okas of milk. The
 pasture didn't grow because of the dry weather and I had to buy fodder
 for my animals."

233 We found some of the men working with others in partnerships termed
 474 *sebrias*. One variety of *sebria* calls for a shepherd to look after and main-
 tain the flock of another for three years. The losses and profits are equally
 shared. After the three-year time limit is up, each *sebro*s (partner) takes
 by lot half of the common flock. If the cooperation comes to an end before
 the expected time limit, the division is made differently; that is, if it lasted
 for two years, the flock is divided into three parts and each partner takes
 one part; the third part is divided, two thirds to the man who owned the
 flock originally and one third to the shepherd. If it lasted one year, the
 owner receives five sixths and the shepherd one sixth of this third part.
 Another variation of the *sebria* was the pooling of animals by the owners
 into a flock which they jointly managed as a common flock and whose
 products they distributed in a proportion equal to the number of sheep
 contributed to the flock. This arrangement is made if the pasture land is
 too large for one man to manage. But even such cooperative arrangements

1: Sanders Z-5.4 (1952-1959) 1962 EH1

Vlaachs EH15

Greece EH1

Peloponnesos

Sara Katsani EH14

The Changing Life of the Shepherd

105

G

do not go far toward meeting the basic economic issues faced by the shepherd today.

233

474 ●

As we talked with these shepherds, all of them dressed shabbily in patched trousers and coats and none of them in the traditional white kilt (*foustanelle*), I realized again the inexorable push of social change. Americans by the hundreds in Greece were diligently and intelligently teaching Greek farmers how to improve their agricultural methods, how to make use of fallow land without losing its fertility, and even encouraging the plains farmers to keep more sheep or cows of their own for milk production. But to the degree that these sensible, reasoned programs succeed, to that extent the shepherds of the mountain villages face what we call in impersonal terms "occupational displacement."

G

233

241

177

178

[291]

[234]

These were my thoughts as I reflected on the experience of my acquaintances in Valtetsi and the shepherds from other Peloponnesian villages with whom I talked at many roadside stops. As background for their hesitant but sincere discussion of their problems is the recollection of the natural setting for our conversations: the brilliant bloom of wild flowers, the blue flax blossoms, the tender new green of the mulberry trees, the leaves pushing out from the gray fig trees standing in terraces on the mountainside, and the vineyards and olive groves stretching out far below, with the shimmering indigo sea off in the distance. Close at hand the earth looked stony and inhospitable to growing things, but always at a little distance the springtime colors caught the eye and made one glad to be in Greece. Now and then I found the shepherds themselves appreciatively viewing the scene around them while keeping a careful watch over their dusty, weary sheep which still had many miles ahead before reaching the succulent summer pastures. I had a feeling that these men on the move would be the first to agree that transhumance in the Peloponnesos, though beset with many problems and facing a clouded future, still had its compensations in the serene beauty of the land through which they walked.

G

124

137

G

517

233

THE "NOMADS" OF EPIRUS

I had no idea when I left the Peloponnesos and its sheep-filled roads that a month later I would be encountering the same kind of migration in Epirus, the rugged and legendary northwestern province of Greece.

G

563

S

V

G

There was one important difference between the shepherds whom I met in Epirus and those in the Peloponnesos. The latter, such as the people of Valtetsi, had been bona fide Greek rancher-peasants who just happened to live in mountain villages where transhumance was their basic adaptation to their environment. In Epirus the shepherds were "nomads," who from time immemorial have made their circuits through Albania, what is now Yugoslavia, southern Bulgaria, and Northern Greece.^a They dress differently from the Greeks; their dwellings are very different; and some of them

[233]

[221]

words, while their problems are growing, they are now gaining the constitutional means of handling them. They may feel oppressed economically, but they are not politically oppressed.

When I asked Berates if he wanted to settle down, he said that it was all right for the small livestock owners, but that it was impossible for a large owner like himself with eight hundred sheep. He would keep on trying to make a go of it as he had done in the past. When asked how he would feel if he did not have to move up to the mountains, his immediate reply was, "I would get sick," and all of the other men nodded their heads affirmatively. "I even have to go to the same spot, not just anywhere up the mountains. And the sheep need the change, too. They got sick during the war when they were not able to make the change."

THE DISAPPEARING TSELINGATA

One of the interesting types of cooperative organization which I hoped to find in Epirus was that of the *tselingata*. I had heard that, just as the agricultural peasants have their village community, so the shepherds in the past grouped themselves under a chief shepherd who directed their activities and also represented the whole group before the outside world. I had also been told that this form of association was found among the nomadic groups but that it was not necessarily identified solely with them.

A clear account of this primitive but practical shepherds' cooperative is contained in a helpful book by K. Koukkides entitled *The Spirit of Cooperation of Modern Greece and of Ambelakia, the First Cooperative of the World*.¹³ In this arrangement each sheep and goat owner contributes his flock as capital and his labor. This union is usually governed by the eldest shepherd, who is called *architselingas* (chief shepherd), and who looks after the organization of the union, rents the pasture land, allots land to each according to the quality of land and to the different categories of animals to be grazed, specifies the work that each member will do, and makes payment for all of the necessary common expenses. In addition, he obtains credit to cover the living expenses of each member and the member's family, regulates the amount paid to each shepherd, pays taxes and any field damage done, and acts as the banker and the "grocer" of the union. At the end of each period he subtracts all these expenses from the general income or fund which has accumulated from the sale of the milk, wool, sheep, and cheese, gives back to his colleagues whatever is due each according to the flock he has brought into the union and according to the personal work he has done, such as pasturing, transporting milk to the cheese plant, milking, making cheese and other dairy products, and taking the goods to the market.

The quantity of milk is estimated according to the number of animals each shepherd has, so that if animal diseases occur in the merged flock the loss will be shared by everybody. An important part of the net profit is

[The Tselingata]
The Changing Life of the Shepherd

119

used for public works, especially for the operation of schools. All these accounts are regulated by the general assembly of the members of the union.

In my conversations with Berates, the visit to whom has just been described, I learned that he considered himself an architselingas. True enough, he owned most of the sheep, but he did allow the six men who worked for him to have flocks of their own, say fifty to sixty head, if they could get a start. One of his shepherds was assigned the task of keeping the records of milk production so that each one could have a share prorated on the basis of the number of animals in the common flock. Every six months Berates draws up a contract with those associated with him; he supervises the cheese production up in the highland pastures and even helps process the milk for some of the smaller owners who are not in position to set up their own plant.

Those who knew Epirus a generation or so ago tell of the great authority these chief shepherds had, each ruling in autocratic fashion his people and the area in which they were established. Should one of the shepherds associated with any of these chieftains become dissatisfied and want to move away, he found it impossible to attach himself to any other chief shepherd, for these men of position stuck together. In the days of turmoil and disorder early in this century, it was almost necessary for a small owner to be connected in some way with a leading figure who could protect him and represent him to outside authorities.¹⁴

The tselingata, from many accounts, were not necessarily based on kinship, though there were interesting examples of the group of relatives being so large that they formed a union by themselves. In such a case, age and generation would usually determine who had the authority and his word would carry great weight among the others.

Even today there are powerful chief shepherds. The mayor of the city of Egoumenitsa, along the Ionian Sea, was the head of the Petoules family which is run on the principles of the traditional tselingata. There are eighty members in the family and all of them obey him. In 1953 I was told that the Petoules family collectively owned from 12,000 to 14,000 sheep, in spite of the fact that on one day in 1948 the Communist guerrillas took 4,200 sheep from them. Although they owned sufficient land to graze at least 14,000 sheep, they were improving the pastures by sowing wild clover. The summer area alone added up to about 3,450 acres and the winter area was additional.

One official in describing this family said that in 1952 some of the governmental representatives in Ioannina were ordered by the central government to go to the head of the Petoules family and take some of the pasture land for the settlement of refugees who needed land. They expected trouble but were pleasantly surprised when the architselingas agreed to give the land and also went with them to select it. Two villages were constructed,

G

V

233

474

●

G

V

[675]

[234]

V

G

233

474

622

V

G

233

474

G

[669]

G

[423]

V 120

Land

G
 233 but these did not hamper the family's activities at all — "Just like a flea on
 474 an elephant," as one of my informants put it.

Originally, late in the nineteenth century, when the family began to rise to prominence, there were four brothers. The second brother became the head, "because he had the most brains," it was said. Upon his death the eldest became head. When the eldest died, the third in line took over until he was killed by the Italians in 1940. Since that time the fourth brother has been chief. Now the family is said to be so numerous that it has run out of names and so has called the most recent arrival "Petoules Petoules." The chief's consent is necessary for the marriage arrangements for everyone in the family and also for all of the hired shepherds employed by it. The family still sticks solely to livestock production but is building huge refrigerators for the cheese awaiting sale and delivery.

V
 G
 233 The Petoules family is now the exception rather than the rule. For many
 178 years to come the tselingata will exist in modified form, but more and more
 [474] the central government will become a substitute for the arbitrary rule of the chief shepherd.¹⁵ Where some old patriarch still holds sway, his grandsons coming back from a tour of duty in the army will plague him with their new ideas, and many will, as many are already doing, refuse to go off on lonely vigils with their flocks. Today hired shepherds are hard to find and the army experience is mentioned over and over again as the cause of the shift to other occupations. Young men with vision, seeing that the future lies elsewhere, are planning accordingly.

STRESS AND STRAIN

G
 233 The changing life of the shepherd is seen not only in the movement of
 241 his flocks from one pasture to another and in his adjustment to the solitude
 578 of days away from home; many facets of his life also are revealed in the
 621 study of his village, as our visit to Valtetsi showed. The real stress and strain between two coexistent ways of life — pastoralism and agriculture — are felt in personal community relationships even more than in the impersonal contacts between peasants and shepherds on the highway.

Greek villages, of course, run the gamut from those where every family is primarily pastoral to those where the only sheep or goats kept are the two or three around the house for a small family milk supply. In between are those with a mixed economy.¹⁶ Two villages of this type, both of which happen to be in Roumele, illustrate the kind of conflict that springs up between farmers and livestock owners, a conflict reminiscent of our earlier American West with the hostility between the open-range cattlemen and the sodbusters who put up barbed-wire fences.

In the first village, near Mesolongi, the farmers complain that they have no security in their fields because the livestock owners have the major power and influence and they follow the old tradition of allowing the flocks

The Changing Life of the Shepherd

121

to graze all over the community area as soon as the harvest is in. If the farmers leave any grain in the fields after harvesting, the sheep seem to think it part of their daily ration and tackle it with delight. The farmers have little recourse, since the sheep owners are elected as community councilmen and officers of the cooperative and are always in a position to defend their interests.

Much the same situation prevails in a village near Agrinion where over seven thousand sheep and over one thousand goats are kept. Recently, some of what was formerly pasture land has been distributed to those without land, through a cooperative association newly formed for that purpose, thus restricting the amount of grazing area. These new owners, as well as others without livestock, resent the invasion of their fields by the flocks immediately after harvest. Little control can be exercised unless shepherds so desire, for none of the parcels are fenced off and it is customary to let the animals roam at will when crops are in.

The nomarch of Serrai stated that in his area of Macedonia it was very common for the whole community to rise up in protest against the pasturing of the flocks by shepherds on land belonging to the community. The shepherds insist that they will continue to use these lands; so the villagers come to the nomarch and ask whether or not they must let those so-and-sos graze sheep on their land. The nomarch assures them that they are within their rights to keep the shepherds off, and they leave the office with a determined look, as though no number of shepherds could budge them from their resolve. When these local leaders get back home, some shepherd comes up to them and says: "My sheep will die, my family will die if you don't let me use that land." The people then change their minds and give the shepherd permission to graze his flocks there. Later on, when they see the nomarch and he asks them what happened, they say: "Poor man, we couldn't let him starve, so we let the sheep graze there." But such disputes do not always end so amicably.

Another source of conflict is the lowly goat. The parties to the conflict are not peasants arguing it out with one another, but rather the forest service trying to forbid the peasants from keeping goats. During the dictatorship of General Metaxas (1936-1941), a law was passed and enforced which forbade the peasants from keeping goats. The justification for this measure is that goats, a browsing animal, do much more damage to the forests than do sheep, a grazing animal. In the case of a pastoral village in Western Macedonia, not far from Kastoria, the prewar number of eight thousand sheep and goats shrank during the conflict because of requisition by the guerrillas, army of occupation, and such, to seven hundred and fifty. In order to rebuild livestock numbers quickly as a means of eking out a living, the people got together flocks of goats. The Agricultural Office has supported them in this, while the Forestry Office opposes the idea. The

233
241
578
621

[423]
[474]

233
578
185
[656]
[669]

[654]

Mutual Aid and Cooperatives

197

Even when death is there, there is help. Who can bury the dead by himself? The village all cry together, they all suffer together, and the whole village buries him. He too is not far away from them. His soul roams around them and, as they say themselves, he watches them.²

476
[764]
[775]

THE AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT IN GREECE

One could logically argue that a people with as many kinds of mutual aid as the Greek villagers should take readily to the cooperative organization designed to assist cooperators, through organized efforts, to achieve goals which they could not hope to satisfy individually. But the transition from informal mutual aid to an organized cooperative proves much more difficult than one would at first imagine. In the first place, since the village mutual-aid patterns are a "here and now" undertaking, those participating can see the immediate results of their labor and can hold the person helped accountable to return assistance to them when needed. The formal cooperative organizations, on the other hand, have to set goals which are removed both in time and place from the average peasant. Not only are the centers of financial control and the markets distant, but the member has to wait for benefits to accrue in the case of a marketing cooperative. In a credit cooperative, the loan received is more tangible, but its attainment has probably seemed to the peasant a long, laborious procedure.

474 •
476
178

The transition from village mutual aid to the formal cooperative organization is difficult, in the second place, because the formal organization itself is an urban rather than a village development. To participate in and guide an organization takes as much "know-how" as repairing a tractor or managing a flock. But it is a different kind of skill from any which the peasant has been trained to use, and he is therefore either ill at ease or grossly inefficient when he tries to work with such a new social mechanism. Parliamentary procedure, the keeping of books and membership lists, and the preparation of reports go on around him all of the time, but he is seldom called upon to participate in such activity. This means that, as a member, he is apt to be passive and apathetic; he is also apt not to understand much of what is done in the cooperative organization and is therefore chronically critical of management, the government, and perhaps the whole idea of formal cooperatives in general. Once he has learned to deal with the social mechanism of the organization, he is much more self-assured and agreeable, but getting to this point takes a great deal of time for most villagers.

[369]

But perhaps a third difficulty in the transition from local mutual aid to membership in the cooperative society is most crucial. Basically the mutual-aid groups consist of family members and neighbors; only occasionally do they even call upon others in the village. The cooperative association makes an immediate leap beyond family and neighborhood to encompass men from the whole village — men who know each other but who have not

- 474 been accustomed to working together. Even more, the cooperative becomes closely identified with the central government, which immediately introduces not only nonfamilial but even nonlocal considerations. This is a psychological gap which many peasants cannot quickly cross. Promoters of cooperatives from outside may see in them a strong support of family and village values; but the peasant sees in them the impersonality of the political authority, the introduction of money rather than exchange of labor as the unit of measurement, and, at times, even questions the motives of those "who are running around trying to get us to join something we don't know anything about." Throughout Greece I found villages at all degrees of opposition or readiness for cooperatives, but where there was resistance these three difficulties were present along with a dozen other reasons the people gave to explain why they did not want to join.

474 The cooperative movement, like so much in Greece, has an interesting past. One important landmark noted by students of cooperatives in Greece was the rise of Ambelakia, a city on the Pencios River in Northern Greece, which became such an important manufacturing center of cotton and silk goods in the seventeenth century that it had trade connections throughout Europe. Its dyed thread was particularly well known then, although its wine is its only product renowned today. Ambelakia rose to economic

474 greatness because of the well-run association which administered the community's affairs. Although this may have been more in the tradition of the guild than a modern cooperative, it nevertheless showed what a single community could do if it organized its efforts in a systematic fashion.⁸ The association of Ambelakia, as well as the modern cooperative movement, is thought by some to have its roots deep in the traditions of local self-government, as the later discussion of this topic will show. Not only would one community organize itself as a viable political and economic unit, but several communities in an area would band together to deal with the Turkish masters. But, significant as these unions were, they were quite different in scope and intent from the agricultural-cooperative movement in Greece today which goes back to 1900. At that time a schoolteacher in the village of Almyros in Thessaly, aroused over the fact that local usurers were charging peasants interest rates as high as 100 percent, organized a local credit or loan society which he called a mutual treasury. This type of organization spread to many communities throughout the country.

474 In 1915 a new law provided for the establishment of cooperatives, with at least seven persons required to form a society. Such a cooperative could be of unlimited liability, with each member having one vote, or it could be of limited liability, with those having more shares being allowed up to five votes but no more. The Cooperative Act provided certain privileges: exemption from import duties on agricultural implements and machinery, seeds, spray materials, and other essential agricultural materials for the

Mutual Aid and Cooperatives

199

exclusive use of the members of the society; and protection by law from interference by outside interests. In return for these privileges, the state reserved the right to approve the by-laws of the cooperatives and to inspect and audit their books.⁴ 474 656

Between the two world wars some of the cooperatives took on a compulsory character. For instance, many refugees who were settled on land in the 1920s were formed into cooperatives which could not be dissolved or from which individuals could not withdraw until complete payment was made. In some districts citrus and grape producers were compelled to deliver their products to the cooperatives. Also, compulsory cooperatives, organized by a majority vote of the farmers in a region, could take over the common utilization of land, forests, and pastures, or the task of grafting of barren and wild trees. Quite aside from these compulsory cooperatives and the widespread credit cooperatives, there were many voluntary cooperatives for marketing, production, and insurance against fire, hail, and frost. [167] [241] [456]

In Greece, as in all other Balkan countries, the agricultural cooperatives through the years have been under the supervision of the Agricultural Bank, from which the government channeled credit to the rural sector of the economy. The local societies were grouped into regional cooperative unions. Instead of having to deal individually with each peasant who wanted a loan on his livestock or against the next crop, the government officials could leave the initial screening of applications to local cooperative officials, then to those at the regional level, while reserving for themselves final approval. Under Metaxas, who ruled as a dictator just prior to World War II, the cooperative section of the Agricultural Bank received no support and, in all probability, cooperatives would have found continuation difficult if Metaxas had been in power for a long period.⁵ 474 652

Then came the war years, which were difficult for cooperatives as well as for everything else in Greece. The situation at the end of the war was described in 1946 when the newly created Food and Agriculture Organization, a specialized agency of the United Nations, sent its very first Mission team to Greece to survey the situation and make recommendations. This team, headed by Franklin S. Harris, President of the Utah State College of Agriculture, found that the "machinery" of cooperative activities had developed to such a point before World War II that it could provide an important facility for postwar rural rehabilitation.⁶ Most of the FAO Mission's recommendations dealt with ways in which this facility could best be used. However, at least two points were brought out which have a direct bearing upon the peasant himself. The first suggests that greater responsibility be given the local village cooperative, thereby placing more control over making individual production loans, receiving repayments, and keeping the individual loan accounts in the hands of the peasants themselves. The general tendency in most cooperative systems is for the center of gravity [643] 474 177 [652]

474 to shift away from the village to the national capital, where the Agricultural Bank is located, or to the provincial cities, where the bank has branches to which the individual peasants are supposed to go to "process" their loans.
177
[652]

A second important question touched upon in the FAO report was whether the producers' cooperative ought to be compulsory in one or both of two ways: first, requiring all of those who produce a given commodity (such as tobacco) and who live in a given village to belong to a cooperative and, second, forcing all cooperative members to market their produce and buy their supplies only through the cooperative. The FAO Mission counseled against making the cooperatives compulsory, and the same point of view has been held by most of the American advisers who have worked with the American Aid Mission in Greece. Greek government officials, [241] however, sometimes think that legal sanctions would strengthen cooperatives and thereby tighten the economic machinery through which 10-12 percent of the Greek tobacco crop and about 80 percent of olive oil, to mention but two crops, reach the market.

474 The cooperative leaders, however, face a problem of social as well as legal sanctions: they would like to guide the cooperative movement from the stage where each cooperative member is a law unto himself to the point where any farmer who fails to sell his produce through his cooperative has to reckon with the disapproval of his fellow farmers. This can only be done through a long-term program of education which stresses not cooperation as an abstract ideal but the fact that a cooperative organization depends upon the support of every member and is not much stronger than its weakest link. It is in this matter of interpretation, of teaching the villager the meaning of cooperation, that the cooperative movement is not very successful. Cooperative officials are so busy being administrators that they do not take time to be interpreters, to be sure their communication strikes a responsive chord in the peasant. Then, too, they tend to feel that they have so much authority (such as fiscal control) in their hands that they do not have to depend upon the subtler forms of authority — namely, pressure by loyal members upon those who would deviate from what is considered good cooperative practice. This is tied in with the psychological problem of making the members feel that the cooperative is theirs rather than the instrumentality of cooperative and governmental officials who live outside the community.
626

474 One report by A. W. Willis, an American marketing specialist, goes so far as to say: "The Greek cooperative law makes cooperatives an arm of the Government and actually prohibits member control as well as any profit acquiring to members. The entire agricultural economy of this state could profit through true Cooperatives but not through those now in existence under the present law."*

Mutual Aid and Cooperatives

201

How strong are cooperatives in Greece today? In 1957, they numbered 7,127 and had a membership of 718,000.* They therefore constitute the principal farm organization in Greece. Those who lead the cooperative movement are quick to point out what they hope to achieve: to narrow the ratio between prices received by the farmers and prices paid by the farmers; to market members' products and purchase for them equipment and supplies; to process farm commodities, produce pesticides, farm machinery; and to provide special services for members such as plowing, cultivating, and harvesting.¹⁰ Since many of the Greek farmers are too impoverished to raise sufficient capital on their own to finance a local cooperative, they are therefore dependent upon those cooperatives for which the government, through the Agricultural Bank, provides all the funds and over which it insists on centralized control.

474
241

[652]
[471]

HOW THE VILLAGERS VIEW COOPERATIVES

What the FAO study team, the American missionaries, and even the Greek government officials think about agricultural cooperatives is secondary to what the Greek peasants themselves think. Their opinions ranged all the way from those of open resentment and hostility to those of great pride in local cooperative achievements. To be told, as was mentioned in Chapter 5, that some villagers whom we wanted to see had hid upon our arrival, for they thought that we were either cooperative officials or connected with the Agricultural Bank, was an object lesson in itself. We asked one of them why he had run away. He replied: "I still owe the Bank a great deal. We have to pay 9 percent interest on what we borrow, 1 percent to the cooperative and 8 percent to the Bank. Last year I hadn't paid off my loan (\$70.), so I couldn't get a new loan. I borrowed what I needed from a private individual at 20 percent and paid off this loan to the bank so that I could obtain potato seed on a new loan. Now I have sold my potatoes and the Bank will be after me to pay them what I owe."

474
652

[426]

When we asked what happened to people who did not repay their loans, we were told that in such cases the collector came out, wrangled with the people, and if he received no repayment took them to court. To such villagers, cooperatives were chiefly credit agencies and in no sense stood for a local association of farmers pooling their energies and resources to achieve joint goals.

Now and then we found peasants who were anxious to start a cooperative but considered the initiation difficult. In a village near Megalopolis in the Peloponnesos, the people were well aware of the difference between prices received in the village for watermelons and what such products cost in Athens. Like farmers everywhere, they thought the price differences unjust. They blamed bureaucratic red tape for holding up the establishment of a cooperative. Some of the more dubious went on to say: "Even if we do

[435]

474 get a cooperative, we will have to wait a year to get a loan approved, and by
[652] that time we will have no need for the money." They thought that from 12 to 14 percent would be the customary interest charges set by the cooperative and the Bank and also assumed that security requirements would be very high.

[249] Peasants in the tobacco-growing areas in Northern Greece appreciated
[664] the fact that cooperatives there tried to introduce mechanization and also,
[124] from time to time, did some lobbying in their behalf. When in 1953 we asked the commandant of gendarmerie for Volos, who was in close touch with the villagers, about their views toward cooperatives he replied: "With the occupation and the war the cooperative conscience more or less disappeared. Now it is reviving and if things go normally there will be quick improvement. One reason for the difficulty is the effort by the government to mix politics in with the cooperative movement. Now the cooperatives undertake no teaching function. They did this before the war, which partially explained what success they achieved. Before the war, if a person wanted to be on the council of the cooperative, he had to go through special training.

[654] The authorities say that they will do this again, but the Ministry of Agriculture is centering its teaching approach in the newly formed Agro Clubs."

He thought that in his area about 60 percent of the cooperatives were working and that 40 percent were either anemic or altogether defunct.

[241] Around Volos the producers' and marketing cooperatives organized on a
[652] commodity basis — vegetables, dairy, fruit, olives — worked better than the general-purpose or purely credit type. Very often, he pointed out, the relationship between the local cooperative and the representatives of the Agricultural Bank is strained, for the local council will give inaccurate information to the Bank, saying that a would-be borrower has twelve acres of land when he really has only five.

474 One of the most interesting examples of the blending of traditional and
178 modern mutual-aid practices was found in Kalivi, a village of about 2500
[621] in Attica. This village owned some pasture land. In 1914 it formed a committee which took charge of the management of this community land, deriving revenues for the community. In 1920 there was talk of organizing a cooperative, but it did not really get under way until 1926, at which time the village pasture land was turned over to the cooperative which superseded the former committee. Thus, the transition from the older social form

[652] to the cooperative went smoothly. The Agricultural Bank had helped the local people decide what was the best kind of cooperative organization for their purposes. They decided that membership should be compulsory for all family heads. In 1928 the cooperative acquired a threshing machine with the funds obtained from the pasture land. This machine as well as newer ones were in use when I visited the village near the middle of June 1953.

[243] Organized pandemonium seemed to reign as new loads of wheat sheaves

[293]
[751]

Mutual Aid and Cooperatives

203

were fed to the threshing machine by the girls, who were wearing goggles and what seemed to be gas masks to protect them from the dust. The women also were wiring the bales of straw which were taken away to be stacked. The president of the community told me:

Anyone who wants to work signs up. Every fifteen days we put on a new crew so that quite a few people are employed and paid. We do have to keep a small permanent crew on the job throughout the threshing season, which lasts about sixty days, but almost every family has a chance to get some benefit. We only do the wheat belonging to the people of our community. We determine by lot the order in which a family's wheat is to be threshed. All the people bring their grain here, for we can thresh it much more cheaply than they could do it with animals.

We then went into the large olive-pressing plant, built in 1948, with a loan of about \$30,000 from the Agricultural Bank, and learned how this part of the cooperative's business was conducted. We learned that each family's batch of olives, like its wheat, was processed separately and that it gave 8 percent of the oil to the cooperative, which is a standard amount taken by presses over Greece, plus an extra 3 percent contribution until the machinery is paid for. After that, it will have to pay only 4 instead of the customary 8 percent. When I noticed an icon in the pressing plant, the manager said that they asked the priest in to bless their work at the beginning of the season. Another man in the company remarked, "we like our religion, but we don't like our priests," a comment with which the others seemed to agree.

The more I learned about this cooperative in Kalivi, the more I realized what a shrewd investment the pasture land had been. The cooperative accumulates no money for itself but reinvests all profits into public works or special funds as determined by the directors of the cooperative. For example, a doctor is paid out of a cooperative philanthropic fund in return for looking after the poor of the community free of charge.

In addition to this general cooperative, to which all family heads belong, there are in Kalivi five other cooperatives. First, there is the credit cooperative explained to me as follows: "Since many people here have to depend upon the Agricultural Bank for loans, the credit cooperative gets the money for them and they do not have to make the contact themselves. If a local peasant wants sulphur or insecticides, the cooperative gets all that is needed. The individual then owes the cost to the cooperative. He pays no membership dues. Both men and women belong." It so happened that the president and the secretary of the community, plus three other people, made up the five-man executive committee of this credit cooperative.

Second, there is a livestock cooperative which the owners of the five thousand sheep in the community support. The members number forty,

474 •

178

243

[293]

[751]

[464]

474

258

[652]

[778]

[788]

474

[758]

[652]

[233]

474 the executive committee five, and the supervising board three. This coop-
 [233] erative helps bring in fodder, sell milk, arrange loans. If a member has
 [652] taken a loan, he must give milk to the cooperative as payment on the loan.
 [245] In some types of loan the shepherd can be responsible directly to the Agri-
 cultural Bank. There are three other cooperatives of lesser importance.
 [231] Everybody belongs to the vineyard cooperative, for all grow grapes, but
 [235] this cooperative has not been very active of late due to a number of eco-
 [434] nomic changes taking place in the village. Fifteen people belong to an apiary
 cooperative; and fifteen others belong to a poultry cooperative, since this
 is a growing source of income for the local people.

[471] These reactions to cooperatives document some of the general observa-
 tions made earlier about the movement. There is a tendency for the for-
 eigners to side with those peasants who are most critical of the way coopera-
 tives are now being run, but any such critic must be prepared to explain
 how one can expect much local control unless the local villagers put up
 some of the working capital, as did the villagers of Kalivi with their pasture
 land. For the most part, members of the Greek cooperatives make no con-
 tributions, buy no shares, pay only nominal membership fees, for the rea-
 son that they do not have sufficient economic margin. Those officials who
 652 lend public funds have to concentrate on control and collection, since it is an
 accepted practice in Greece, as in many parts of the world, for the farmer
 to borrow as much as he can and pay back as little as he can. The educa-
 tional task, then, is the difficult one of teaching the necessity of honoring
 one's contracts to the cooperative as truly as the peasant honors his in-
 formal agreements to pay back labor in a traditional mutual-aid activity.
 It also calls for the community-wide recognition that peasants who are de-
 faulting on their payments are hurting fellow members in the cooperative
 and should in time be made to feel the censure of those who are keeping
 agreements. But, most important of all, the cooperatives could be inter-
 preted as social mechanisms through which the peasants can do more than
 merely borrow money or get fertilizer on credit — as avenues through which
 they can effectively increase their general economic well-being.

476 In the final analysis, however, mutual aid in a Greek village consists of
 more than the informal patterns, such as the potato-digging group of Neo-
 chori; it is more than the cooperative organizations in all of their variations.
 It also includes the philanthropic assistance, to be discussed in connection
 with religion, and the "voluntary labor" required of the community mem-
 bers by their community council, an interesting form of mutual effort to be
 discussed under local government.

The Village Community

277

In my childhood when the teacher or priest would pass through the village square people would stand up. The local merchants in the village have changed their status little, for their role in life is still to do commerce.

554

875

793

622

[474]

The extent to which the priest or the president of the local cooperative, where it exists, is considered important depends today very much upon the personalities of the individuals involved. One person said:

The role of the priest should be mentioned along with the teacher and doctor. He should lead because he represents the church and is more educated than the peasants. But there are some priests who play little part in community life. I know of one who drinks too much, shoots off his revolver, and is not respected.

The relative prestige of the village notables has been influenced by the practice of the central government in providing the teacher and the priest. Only the community president comes into office as the result of local initiative, but even his status, though gaining ground, is not what it used to be thirty or forty years ago:

The president of the village is usually a better man than the president of the cooperative because there is more tradition behind his office. But it does not always hold that the best man is picked as president. In Thessaly forty years ago when the president came into the coffeehouse all the men rose in deference to "their president."

[474]

A man from a mountain village in Central Greece who is active in the cooperative movement contrasted the various statuses in his community:

I find that the teacher enjoyed more prestige formerly than now. Earlier there was a higher percentage of illiterates, but today many village sons have gone away for a higher education and so people are not so dependent upon the teacher. Since officials do not wish to undermine the position of the teacher, the agronom and other representatives of the nomarchia always consult the teacher when arriving in the village.

This man thought the secretary of the village more important than the president.

When I put the question of relative prestige of the notables to a group of students at the American Farm School in Salonica, I found the anticipated difference of opinion. The majority of the boys, all from villages, said that the president of the community was most important, but others said that the priest would be "if he is from the village itself and has a good reputation." They pointed out that the president of the community becomes involved in politics and is therefore apt to antagonize those who may differ with him politically. Of the twenty villages represented, fourteen had doctors. Only six of these were considered community leaders. These village boys also thought, for the most part, that the wealthy peasants were

[759]

575
[474] For men, the cooperatives are the chief associations, although meetings are relatively infrequent since these are primarily service organizations. They have not yet really taken on the educational role displayed by the youth or women's groups.

575
571 At best, these organizations which have been described exist to satisfy the interests of the members who affiliate. Unlike the institutionalized church board, school board, and community council, they do not exist to serve community-wide needs even though many of their stated purposes might contain grandiose aims. Most of these are not organizations which the villagers themselves have created, but have been formed in response to outside pressures and have been founded in the hope that they will do something to help the villagers have a better life. What makes the promotion of such organizations difficult is the utter lack on the part of the peasant of an abstract loyalty to an organization; he goes if he wants to or if he likes the agent from outside — not because he feels it his duty as a member to support the group of which he is a part.

Even if the numbers of organizations in rural Greece were doubled and the membership quadrupled, it is hardly likely that the Greek peasant would think of the "organizational approach" to problem solving. Where some Americans might get together and form a group to deal with a problem, the Greek peasants would either say "let the central government do it" or, if they are more sophisticated, relegate it to the community council to worry about. There is no tie-in between individual responsibility and membership-in-action groups, such as one finds in suburban America; the peasant is in the preorganization stage, which perhaps indicates why his life seems so untrammelled to those who get to know him well.

THE SENSE OF COMMUNITY

621
182 Greek village life has a unity in the sense that the peasants see their life as a whole and do not compartmentalize it in the way that it has been presented here. They make no distinction between religion and agriculture, family life and recreation, mutual aid and local government. Life flows on day by day, each day with its own tasks and joys, but marked by the variations which the seasons bring. Nor does the Greek villager distinguish in his mind among his village as a place or physical setting, his home, or the people who walk the streets. All these, to which we might also add the donkeys, goats, and other animals, possess a unity in that they fit together as a part of his accustomed world.

621
578
665
669
182 But Greek village life does not have a unity in the sense that there is perfect agreement within the community on every course of action or in the sense that people placidly sit by and concur in what a few self-appointed leaders might choose to do. Factions arise, and many of them persist. These can arise in time of war when rival armies visit the village in the search

Social Change in Rural Greece

301

tional director, H. B. Allen, in his book *Come Over Into Macedonia*. This program also trained Greek personnel, who were later to play important roles in the rural rehabilitation of Greece. With the coming in, under the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, of the American Mission to Greece, staffed and financed to deal with rural problems on a tremendous scale, the Near East Foundation decided about 1953 to end its Greek program in order to concentrate on assisting Near Eastern countries not receiving the support which was being officially extended to Greece by the American government. But one of its final achievements was the elementary, but nevertheless very useful, series of village studies conducted by its staff, to which frequent mention has been made in this book. The Near East Foundation was also instrumental in bringing the first Fulbright professor to Greece — Howard W. Beers, who taught the first courses in rural sociology to be given in Greece (at the Superior School for Agriculture, Athens) and who initiated the village studies just mentioned.

Several references have also been made to the American Farm School of Salonica, which celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in 1955. Founded by Reverend John Henry House, and continued by his son, Charles, and daughter-in-law, Ann, the school has been a vital force in the improvement of agriculture in many sections of Northern Greece. Bruce Lansdale, who succeeded Charles House as director, is also seeing to it that the school, through a community-development program, extends its influence even more directly to the villages. One of its activities is to offer short courses for groups of village leaders — priests, community presidents, and others — who come in to discuss how they can improve life in their communities.

Before World War II, the cooperative movement — described in Chapter 10 — sought to raise the economic conditions of the villages. The Food and Agriculture Organization Mission, viewing the prewar record of the cooperatives, cited in its 1946 report that these organizations had pioneered in the development of bucket pumps, tobacco water-storage tanks, and, through financial aid, the development of improved farm practices. Also, the national government had agricultural specialists who advised villagers on farm problems, but the success of these individuals was minimal as compared to postwar developments.

A survey of prewar programs of planned change, therefore, would indicate that either they reached only special areas where pioneering measures were being tried by private agencies or that they covered the country generally but relatively ineffectively through cooperatives and officials of the Ministry of Agriculture. This is not to imply that rural Greece was static during this period; only that it was not yet receiving the impact of planned change that was to characterize the years following World War II.

In turning to these postwar efforts, a selection has to be made from a wide variety of endeavors. The United Nations, for instance, helped in sev-

177
178177
178874
242

[185]

178
474
185
242178
185
654177
464
653

Social Consequences of Foreign Aid

309

commercial farmer. To be sure, the peasant does use some money, and some colonial powers in the past have found that the way to persuade "natives" to grow cash crops that the authorities wanted for export was to require that taxes be paid in money rather than in kind. To get the money, the peasant had to put in some cash crop, and he eventually moved toward commercial farming. Both types of farmers periodically become involved in debt: the peasant because he wants to spend an extravagant amount on some village festival, wedding, dowry, pilgrimage, or other noneconomic expenditure, whereas the modern farmer — though he also may try to keep up with the Joneses — goes into debt to buy machinery and other capital equipment. The peasant in earlier days went to the village moneylender, whose rates were oppressively high since he as a debtor could give little collateral, but now under government auspices credit cooperatives are moving out to the villages to provide loans to the villager on his livestock or an expected harvest. The modern farmer uses the financial institutions which are an integral part of a complex economy.

The production for a market highlights another difference. The peasant is primarily oriented toward the present; the modern farmer thinks of the future. The peasant, because he has had little economic margin with which to experiment or accumulate, tries to get through one crop year at a time. He may think vaguely about the future in terms of the hopes he has for his children, but seldom in hardheaded economic terms. When he begins to put out vines, to plant olive trees, or to make capital investment connected with agricultural production, the peasant is changing into a farmer — in this one trait, at least.

Both the peasant and the farmer operate in terms of what they consider to be their own self-interest, but they differ in their conceptions of what their self-interest is. The so-called obstinacy of the peasant is not just irrational opposition to change for the sake of holding back progress; it arises from his refusal to believe that the innovation suggested is to his own self-interest. Many times the peasant shrewdness shows up when some new scientific practice fails because of the soil and weather conditions of a given area. Demonstration, rather than talk, works more effectively with the peasant. The farmer, on the other hand, is more willing to take the word of the agricultural specialist, whether spoken or written, and may even do some experimenting on his own. If he is moderately successful, he has a margin for experimentation, whereas the peasant's food supply or source of the cash that he needs would be jeopardized if the innovation proved unsuccessful. Rather than fly to evils that he "knows not of," he sticks with the ways that have helped his people survive through the centuries.

This same conservatism shows up in the peasant's attitude toward his land. The peasant prizes land above all else, whereas the farmer views it as a commodity to be bought and sold. Land has been the peasant's secur-

184
241
511[426]
[474]184
241
178

[242]

184
423
454

184 ity; if he has a few acres available to him he knows that he can put in a crop
423 and maintain life; without land he is helpless. That is why many peasants
454 will insist on buying more land when they get a sum of money. The modern
farmer, on the other hand, views land as only one of the factors of production. He can be quite impersonal toward particular patches of land, whereas in some countries the peasants feel closely attached to family acres handed down through two, three, or more generations. Peasant fathers, too, feel a strong sense of obligation to pass on to their children the patrimony of land intact, if possible. At times, this is even more important than providing the children with an education or a respectable dwelling. The modern farmer may feel much more security in the cash balances in the bank or in the improvements made on the land he has rather than the acquisition of more land simply for the sake of adding acreage to his estate.

178 Perhaps the most visible contrasts, as one passes from a peasant farming
241 belt to one of modern farms, is the presence of machinery in the latter.
594 The peasant relies on family labor to help not only with ordinary daily tasks
184 but as much as possible to meet the needs at peak periods, such as harvest
464 time. Any money given to outsiders who help is that much taken away
from the family exchequer. This means that a peasant with many children is considered blessed over one with few, for the many sons especially are economic assets, though daughters help until they are married off as members of their husbands' family labor reserve. As Chapter 5 has shown, the purchase of a tractor by a Greek farm family ushers in numerous changes. Arthur Mosher, who is familiar with agriculture both in the Far East and in Latin America, points out the following consequences of shifting from family labor to machinery.⁴ First, by reducing the labor requirements it frees members of the family for work in the city and may even necessitate their search for employment away from the village — a fact which introduces change into what may have been a closed family circle. Second, there is sometimes a change in status of the sons and younger men of the family who, unlike the older men, know how to operate the newly acquired machine. In peasant families, where the word of the older people, especially the father, has been law and where there is supposed to be unquestioned obedience to his directives, the emergence of a new technical "authority" in the family is bound to produce changes in the family relationships. A third effect of mechanization treated by Mosher is the creation of greater socioeconomic disparity between large and small farms, since mechanization is usually more economical on large farms. This tendency of the rich to get richer and the poor to get poorer is sometimes offset, however, by the poorer farmers pooling their resources and setting up a small joint-ownership group, similar to some of the threshing "rings" of the American Midwest a generation or so ago. Or the small farmers may get the advantages of mechanization if the machines can be rented to them when needed,

178

241

184

[474]

FAMILY AND KIN STRUCTURE • 73

relatives who are, of course, automatically acquired by birth. Certainly this is a real distinction between the affinals and *kumburi*, on the one hand, and consanguineals on the other, but, in Vasilika at least, it is not a difference of preponderant functional importance. In practice, any significant relationships established even between consanguineal kin outside of the elementary family are voluntarily arranged, and this element of the situation is more important than is the fact that the pool of blood kin from whom a man or woman can make the choice is predetermined.

602
608
612

Let us summarize the situation this way: A man and his elementary family can normally provide all the personnel needed for the year-round functions on his farm. At peak periods the farmer hires the necessary additional labor. However, from time to time he may need temporary help. He may need an extra horse for plowing, or he may want to join with someone to fill a truck with grain for a trip to the mill or with cotton for a trip to the gin; or he may need an extra hand or two to string tobacco or to separate cotton from the pod, or he may want someone to help with irrigation, or he may wish to join with another family for the Easter feast. For both giving and receiving assistance of this kind, Vasilika's farmers seem to consider all the village's inhabitants, kin or non-kin, *kumburi* or non-*kumburi*, neighbor or non-neighbor, as almost equally suitable candidates. A farmer may choose one non-neighbor villager who has a good horse, and exchange plowing assistance with him, a next-door neighbor with whom he joins in sending grain to the mill, a village sister to help with tobacco stringing to whom he gives a bottle of wine or the like in return, and so on. Moreover, none of these arrangements is necessarily permanent; the personnel may vary from year to year and from season to season. Indeed, shifting relationships of this kind are more common than permanent ones. From our point of view, the significance lies in the fact that whether or not kin are involved, the type of association is the same.

474 ●
476
602
608
241

There is one notable exception. No matter how valuable assistance might be, it is not sought after if the individuals capable of rendering it belong to a family with whom there is an acute, even if temporary, disagreement. For example, although one of the village girls was adept at giving penicillin injections, a woman from a family which was on bad terms with that of the girl preferred to leave the village for a week to live with a town relative who was also capable of giving the injections. The trip was inconvenient for the ill woman's family, and since she was not fond of her relative, the visit was actually distasteful to her. But neither of these considerations was compelling enough to have her choose what in her and her family's opinion was the worse alternative—to ask assistance from a village family with whom they were currently in acrimonious rivalry. Feuding of this kind can occur among kin as well as among neighbors.

476
578
602
758
608

Apart from the agricultural production cycle and other predominantly village-centered activities, Vasilika's farmers need help in arranging marriages, in educating their children, in finding employment, in dealing with government officials and with merchants to whom they sell their produce. They also want some urban associations simply for prestige, and to provide a place to stay if they visit towns and cities. For these extra-village purposes, a farmer is more likely

476
369
602
608
574
557

THE VILLAGE SCHOOL · 97 731

planting that season accepted the fact with resignation. The agitation died down after several days and the matter was not mentioned again. 312
208

Let us return now to the other officials and organizations that have responsibilities concerning the village as a whole. Law enforcement in Vasilika is in the hands of two *agbrosflakes* (rural policemen). They are appointed by the nomarch and are responsible for preventing and detecting animal trespass in the fields and thefts of produce as well as of personal property. They also watch sales of cotton and tobacco and can therefore furnish information of value for estimating produce taxes. The village police are sometimes called in to deal with disorderly conduct or with any physical violence which threatens to become serious. The *agbrosflakes* wear grey uniforms with green trim and are easily distinguished from the other villagers. Vasilika's police used to be *kteni* (strangers) who came from two different neighboring villages, but in 1961 the men were natives of the village who were relatives of the then current president. 625
[634]
[674]
[651]
[292]
[661]

There are two other semigovernmental village-wide organizations: the agricultural cooperative credit society, and the welfare committee. The villagers elect a president of the credit society, whose signature is necessary on almost all requests for credit, since the Agricultural Bank works in conjunction with the cooperative. The village priest, the president of the council, and the president of the agricultural credit society constitute the welfare committee. They attest to the financial need of a villager who wishes to avail himself of free government welfare services. In most cases, however, the village families who occasionally need help receive irregular gifts of food and clothing from other village families, and their plight is not considered a matter for joint village action. When several cartons of surplus American butter, cheese, and powdered milk reached the village, it was the priest who distributed the goods. On that occasion, the daughter of one of the recipients brought some butter (which the villagers usually do not use in cooking or baking) to a neighbor's daughter, who contributed eggs, flour, and sugar. The two girls spent a busy afternoon mixing a cake according to a half-remembered recipe given them by an extension worker some years before. The cake was not a success by any standards for such confections, but the girls were satisfied because they had produced a European-style sweet. 624
[474]
[652]
[793]
[657]
[735]
252
177

The Village School

The village school is supervised and controlled by the Ministry of Education in Athens. The teacher is appointed by the ministry, which also prescribes the curriculum. In Vasilika, in 1955-1956, the school had thirty pupils distributed unevenly among the six grades. The first grade had the largest number of children because its ranks were augmented by the children of the shepherds, some of whom had had no previous schooling and were assigned to the first grade regardless of age. A man originally from the Peloponnesus taught the children. He had married a woman from Parori, who was herself one of the 872
875

[Villages of the Plains]

108

THE VILLAGES

621 had acquired sixty "heads of family," mostly migrants from hill
166 villages in the neighborhood, during the years between 1950
and 1956. Some of these immigrants brought families with
them, others married into the village, but exact figures of the
number of persons who have moved into the village are not
available.

Nevertheless, Old Corinth definitely exhibits the pattern of
internal migration which may in time allow the hillsmen of
Greece to share in the rising prosperity of the villages of the
plains, for migration into the community from the hills has been
in part offset by another current of migration from Old Corinth
into larger urban centers — either to nearby New Corinth or to
Athens, some seventy miles off. Thirty-five to forty persons
moved away to these centers between 1947 and 1956, accord-
ing to the village president.

245 The reason for this mobility is that Old Corinth has become
439 prosperous as never before. For centuries the agriculture of the
community has centered upon currants; and since the seven-
teenth century the major market for this crop has been in Eng-
land. Commercial agriculture is therefore no novelty, but the
prosperity of the village has long been heavily at the mercy of
the English market, and, more recently, access to this market
has depended largely upon the Australian currant crop. To cul-
tivate, pick, dry and sort currants is a labor-consuming task;
and the Australian labor shortage in the postwar years proved
a remarkable blessing for Corinth. Since 1954, when devalua-
tion of the drachma cleared the way for export, currant prices
have been good.

241 This is only a small part of Corinth's good fortune. Owing
• 474 largely to unusually wise and energetic leadership on the part
433 of the village president, who has enjoyed a unique standing in
the community, the two cooperatives which were organized
* 178 before the war and were bankrupted during it were re-estab-
lished by 1952.

6: McNeill H-5 (1947, 1956) 1957

EH1 Greece EH1
Paleo Corinthos

[Villages of the Plains]

THE VILLAGES

109

lished by 1952. Through their instrumentality a series of im-241
portant changes have come to the agriculture of the village.474●
Fertilizer, bought through the cooperatives, has played its usual433
role in increasing wheat yields. In addition, a new variety of178x
wheat has been introduced by the agricultural extension agent;[242]
this has still further increased the harvest, so that in 1956 the
farmers counted on between 200 and 300 okes of wheat per
stremma, compared with their prewar expectation of 80 to 100.
The co-ops also have been able to buy two tractors and two[407]
harvesting machines that cultivate all the crop land of the com-[427]
munity. These machines are hired out to neighboring villages
when not needed in Old Corinth, and bring in a fair sum of
money.

The most significant step, however, has been the drilling of178x
irrigation wells. Irrigation began on a modest scale before the312
war, but in 1947 fuel for the pumping engines was hard to241
come by and many of the thirty wells the village then possessed406
were not used fully. By 1956 the number of wells and pumps433
had increased to 163, and all were in full use. Most of the suit-
able land in the village has come under irrigation. On this land,[438]
the villagers raise garden vegetables, especially tomatoes, and
despatch them daily to the Athens market by truck. The result,[434]
in terms of money income, is spectacular. I was assured that a
farm now yields ten times the income it supplied before the
war.

Old Corinth has also benefited from the revival of tourism.178x
In 1955, some 72,000 tourists visited the archaeological museum[457]
and the ruins on the outskirts of the village; and most of these265
visitors left at least some small change behind them in one of
the coffee houses or in the new tourist restaurant which the[346]
government constructed in 1955. Moreover, Old Corinth lies[365]
near the new electric power line. Electricity came to the village
for the first time in 1956. Of all the changes benefiting them in

6: McNeill H-5 (1947, 1956) 1957

EH1 Greece EH1

Paleo Corinthos

[Villages of the Plains]

THE VILLAGES

111

higher than wages for unskilled labor in Athens. It is these wage rates, of course, that have attracted new settlers from the hills; but the fact that such labor is seasonal, lasting for only about four months in the year, means that families depending entirely on wage work are often in very hard straits.

The unparalleled prosperity that the years since 1953 have brought to the farmers of Corinth has been accompanied by the development of a number of nonagricultural occupations within the village. Several new stores and two new coffee houses have come into existence as well as the fancy restaurant for tourists. A number of persons also make a living as tourist guides. The richest men in the village, however, are merchants who have organized the delivery of tomatoes and other vegetables to the Athens market; they employ truck drivers, not all of whom live in the village. The two cooperatives employ, between them, a full-time, professionally trained secretary. The museum has a small staff of caretakers and curators. The village school had 210 pupils in 1956 and employed three teachers. A priest officiates in a handsome new church, which the villagers have built out of their own resources. Old Corinth, in other words, is developing into a small town, and ceasing to be a mere village. If the plan, only talked about in 1956, for establishing a small canning factory to preserve tomatoes is ever realized, the transition to a town status will become definite.

Nevertheless, from one point of view, the community has so far remained thoroughly traditional in its social organization. The substantial farmers of Old Corinth continue to adhere to age-old patterns of family life. When it comes time for their children to marry, the daughters are dowered, partly with money and partly with a share of crop land, vineyard and olive grove; and sons, similarly, inherit their portion of the parental farm. Clearly, if there are more than two children — and this is almost universally the case — the new generation will have to

Farm Implements. The average farmer
/48 cont./ has the following implements.

1 Harrow	\$3
1 Plow, iron	1.50
1 Wooden plow	1.00
1 Yoke	1.00
3 Hoes	0.35
2 Shovels	0.25
2 Sickles	0.35

241
422
407
[412]
[435]

The above are the implements which the farmer uses in his farming. Borrowing of tools and implements is extensively practiced by the farmers. Some of the implements and machinery that are too expensive to be owned by one farmer are owned cooperatively such as seed cleaning machine, harrow and harvesting machines. This cooperative movement is very successful and solves some of their pressing economic problems. Some of the implements are made locally and all repairs are done by the local blacksmith.

[474]•

/49/ Domestic Animals. The livestock problem is one which is still in its infancy. All the sheep are owned by the Thracians and they are increasing them every year. The sheep is the competitor of the cow. A farmer can live without sheep but cannot do without cows, since the only source of power is the cow. The feeling between the sheep owners and the rest of the farmers is not very good, and may develop into a very critical conflict if steps are not taken ahead of time to prevent it. Since pasturing the fields and community pasture is free to any one, the sheep take advantage of this law and get the greatest benefit in competition with the cows.

[326]
[445]
233

[492]
[578]

[423]

The local cows are a mixture of the scrubby Macedonian breed and so far no attempt was made to improve the livestock.

One solution discussed for solving some of the pressing problems of livestock is by taxation as follows:

1. No tax should be paid by the sheep up to 12 head.
2. 12 to 25 heads 15 cents per head.
3. 25 to 40 " 30 " " "
4. 40 to 80 " 75 " " "

/55 cont./

The low water table of only 18 to 24 feet, the flat land that will make irrigation easy, the nearness to the railroad station and to a big city, are the outstanding privileges of the farmer of Megali Vrisi to shift his farming methods and produce enough to improve his family living conditions. Nothing could meet his economic needs better than the combination of dairying with small cereals.

241

/56/ Cooperative Activities. A village system and the type of farming such as in Megali Vrisi makes cooperative movement essential. The limited capital of the individual farmer makes it hard to conduct his farming operations successfully. The type of living together has brought them the spirit of cooperation. Before any kind of organized cooperative movement started, there was already very close cooperation among the villagers in hiring a common shepherd, sharing alike in the erection and care of the school and church, repairing the roads, helping each other at harvest and in numerous other ways. The cooperative spirit was taught to them in the family from the type of family life they were living. Nothing explains so well their success in being able to establish themselves in the village, in such a short time as work-through the cooperative to help each other.

621

476

[241]
[474]

[866]

Since the settlement of the village the people organized a cooperative with a capital of \$15,000. A threshing machine and a tractor of 64 horsepower was bought. All the farmers thresh their cereals and pay 11% of the crop. With the accumulated capital a flour mill with four grinding stones was built. The flour mill, besides serving the village, draws customers from the neighboring villages. The flour mill charges 3% /57/ of the grain. The cooperative organized a grocery which serves the members. It also bought 3 improved pure-bred bulls for the village herd. The cooperative has its own 15 acres of land where it conducts experiments for the farmers of the village with fertilizers, seeds and grass plants. All loans from the Agricultural Bank are made through the cooperative. All the Caucasians are members, but only 65% of the Thracians are members. The cooperative is one

241

474

[407]

[256]

[444]

[232]

[621]

/57 cont./

of the outstanding institutions in the village which guides the people in keeping accounts and in taking active part in appointing officers every year.

241
474
[621]

The yearly meeting of the cooperative lasts 2 days and all the men who served in the army take active part. After the committee presents its accounts and accomplishments and its future program, a discussion starts from different members either praising or criticizing the work of the existing committee. Different proposals for improvement are made and finally it ends with a vote for a new committee of six. During these two days of discussion people learn from each other how to judge and evaluate certain deeds of the cooperative.

The government, understanding the importance of the cooperative has organized the Ministry of Cooperatives /58/ under the auspices of the Agricultural Bank. The effect of the cooperative on the people is great not only on the economic life but also on their social life as well. It draws the people close together and they think not in terms of their immediate need but of their future welfare.

[647]

Every year the cooperative sends two students to the high school, gives prizes to the farmers that raise good seed and harvest animals, gives financial aid to the poor, and helps the infirm and sick to go to hospitals. These are signs of the role the cooperative can play in the near future.

[741]

Besides unifying the whole village into an economic unit, it is becoming a center of spreading higher ideals among the people. Its powers at the present are restricted due to the lack of experienced men with foresight. There are possibilities for one to do more in devising community programs by working with the cooperative.

[621]

Farm Technique. The biblical type of farming is still the kind that yields the greater returns with the least cost. The animal power is composed of oxen with a yoke and an iron plow. The wooden plow till has its /59/ blessing for certain soils. In soil

241
[492]
[407]

/60 cont./

Rotation of crops is neglected due to the high price of wheat. The best land is put into wheat and the poor land into oats and barley. The recent introduction of vetch may revolutionize the rotation system and may help answer the livestock management problems.

The Local Groceries. Out of five groceries two have closed due to depression years of 1930-33. The three groceries are doing well only on books. Their /61/ non-collected capital exceeds 3 times their active capital. The cooperative grocery gives keen competition but its credit is limited to members and it has a successful way of collecting the debts at threshing time with the cooperatives' threshing machine. Just before threshing the three local groceries treat their customers with wine and whisky so as to be able to collect their debts. All kinds of methods are used at harvest time.

The local grocery owners do their farming too and in most cases all their farming jobs are done by the farmers in paying their debts. No grocery man could make his living out of grocery business alone, but keeps it for spending his leisure time.

PART IV. HABITS OF CONSUMPTION

Household Expenditures. People who lose all they had two to four times in their lifetime will not want to buy anything unless its need is essential. Life is more or less simplified and the household expenditures run very low. In one of the accounts we find that for household expenditures the farmer spent 2.500 drs. (\$15.66). This sum is too high. We must remember that these farmers were just settled and had nothing whatsoever to start with.

/62/ A few small chairs, a rough table, a few wooden spoons and a few copper kitchenware make the kitchen's utensils. Pictures of a few relatives and their own hang on the wall with a few handmade embroideries.

241
242

444
452
[458]
[474] •
[273]

[241]
[463]

511

[352]
[415]
[353]
[531]

There is at present a paradoxical situation in Greece. There is pride in the many co-operatives, spread throughout the country; there is delight on the part of some of the technical assistants because the groundwork for the introduction of necessary change is there, and there is dismay on the part of others that the Greeks do not know what co-operation means, that they have to be compelled to work for the benefit of the village, to be prevented from destroying its resources, and to be coerced to co-operate even in efforts for their own welfare. There is distress over the number of pressure groups created to get whatever they can from the government. All this is true. According to their own phrasing of co-operation and within the framework of the meaningful units, the Greeks were, and to some extent are now completely co-operative. Families and villages were responsible for their own indigent; a prominent peasant would impoverish himself to build a village school or improve the water system. They made their own decisions and carried them out; they chose their own leaders. The first co-operatives were started on local initiative in the last century. But later, the central government began to institute co-operatives on a foreign pattern, taking no account of the existing units of co-operation, or of the existing patterns of self-participation. The villages were not allowed a responsible role in creating the co-operatives—in fact, in co-operating. The state-financed Agricultural Bank has been in charge of creating local credit co-operatives but the peasants have felt that this was a government affair. Actually the rate, which was eight per cent at the time of the establishment of the bank in 1928, and is now as high as 18 per cent, with incidental fees, which peasants get from the bank through their credit co-operatives, does not seem to have been set with the welfare of the farmers in view, or according to their decision. In 1936, more than 3,000 of the 3,761 were credit co-operatives under the central supervision of the state. The others, such as the producers' co-operatives, were mainly compulsory. Such were the citrus growers' associations in Crete, the wine growers' association in Samos, Levkas, Attica, and Chalkis. There are now marketing co-operatives and machine-owning co-operatives, as well as a growing number of processing co-operatives. In general, the co-operatives are firmly controlled by the central government and the farmers are not even allowed to co-operate to the extent of electing their own officers. As a result, the attitude toward external authority has been evoked, and, in most cases, co-operation has to be compulsory as all government legislation has to be compulsory, and the so-called co-operative decisions are circumvented like all government decisions. Another attitude has also been evoked, particularly among those Greeks who welcomed the dictatorship; deprived of responsible decision and participation, these people fell into the pattern of accepted dependency; such people, unaware that they are "co-operating", say: "The government is

178 taking good care of us." The government itself, aware of this shifting
 424 of responsibility and lack of participation, urges the people, in its
 372 organ, *The Battle for Survival*, to work for their own welfare and to
 829 turn to the State only for guidance, or when they can do no more for
 themselves. It tries to put this co-operation on a par with war, both
 in the title of its bi-weekly publication, and in the phrasing of its
 admonition. But the disrupting centralization, the hated interference,
 remains. "Compulsory free labour" is demanded of the farmers, and
 there is a whole class of compulsory co-operatives for the betterment
 of the villages. These are circumvented with the ingenuity born of
 long experience. However we also have a recent report of a village
 where everyone gets up when the church bell rings at four in the
 morning, to work, without compulsion, on some village project, with
 pride and enthusiasm. The work is done under the leadership of a
 villager respected for his ability and disinterestedness. It appears that
 when the co-operative pattern which is already present is utilized,
 the villagers will work together for the common welfare.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

- 113 G. F. Abbott, 1903; Harold B. Allen, 1943; Koste Charitaki, 1948;
 Willie Snow Ethridge, 1947; Lucy M. J. Garnett, 1896; Kathleen
 Gibberd, 1944; Peter Gray, 1942; Marshall Hertig, 1950; Socrates
 A. Kaloyereas, 1948; Georgion I. Karmoule, 1926; Anna Katsigra,
 n.d.; Georgion N. Kazave, 1940; N. C. and C. N. Kokkolatos, 1947;
 B. J. Marketos, 1945; J. B. McDougall, 1947—48; Henry Morgenthau,
 1929; N. P. Polites, 1914; D. Psatha, 1937; Malvina I. Salvanou, 1926;
 Frank Smothers, William Hardy McNeill and Elizabeth Derbishere
 McNeill, 1948; C. S. Stephanides, 1948a, 1948b, 1948c; Athena
 Tarsoule, 1947, 1948, 1950; Clayton E. Whipple, 1944.